



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,552	10/24/2003	Robert C.U. Yu	D/A2002Q2D	3632
25453 7	590 08/06/2004		EXAMINER	
PATENT DOCUMENTATION CENTER			VAN, QUANG T	
XEROX CORI	-	OX SQUARE, 20TH FLOOR	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ROCHESTER,	-	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	3742	
			DATE MAILED: 08/06/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			. 1
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	MIN
0.55	10/693,552	YU, ROBERT C.U.	VU
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Quang T Van	3742	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence addre	SS
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of the provision of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statue Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this comm ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.
Status			
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matt		erits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,5,6,13-15 and 23 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3,4 and 7-11 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 12-22 and 24 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	is/are withdrawn from consi	ideration.	
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 October 2003 is/ar Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ o e drawing(s) be held in abeyar ection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documer application from the International Bure. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A iority documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Sta	эge
See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies flot	received.	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/24/03.	Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-15	52)

Art Unit: 3742

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Species IV (Figure 9, claims 1,3,4,7-12, and 24 in the reply filed on June 04,2004 is acknowledged. Non-elected claims 2, 5-6, 13-15, 23 are withdrawn from consideration.

Double Patenting

2. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

3. Claims 12 and 16-20 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim12 and 16-20 of copending Application No. 10/063,974. The slightly difference between the application and the copending Application No. 10/063,974 is that the term "a **treatment**; and a heat and pressure source arranged to heat **the treatment strip** applied to the belt seam region..." recited in claim 12, lines 3-4 of the application is slightly different from the term "a heat and pressure source arranged to heat a **treatment strip** applied to the belt seam region..." recited in claim 12, line 3 of the copending Application No. 10/063,974.

This is a <u>provisional</u> double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 3742

NOTE: The Examiner interpreted the term "a heat and pressure source arranged to heat **a treatment strip** applied to the belt seam region..." recited in claim 12, line 3 of the copending Application No. 10/063,974 as a positive recitation. Therefore, there is no different between claim 12 of the application and claim 12 of the copending Application No. 10/063,974.

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 21-22 and 24 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 21-22 and 24 of copending Application No. 10/063,974. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the differences between the two sets of claims are that, for example, the claims of the instant application recite "a tube with a smooth outer surface", whereas the claims of the copending application merely recite "a tube with a smooth, **abhesive** outer surface". The claims of the instant application are merely broader than the claims of the

Application/Control Number: 10/693,552

Art Unit: 3742

copending application. The claims of the copending application "anticipate" the application claims. Therefore, the two set of claims are not patentable distinct.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

- 6. Claims 1, 3-4, and 7-11 are allowed.
- 7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record does not show or suggest a flexible belt seam treatment comprising a support element with a smooth surface arranged to support a belt seam region a treatment strip and a heated pressure element arranged to heat and force the treatment strip against the belt seam region and both the treatment strip and the belt seam region toward the support element as recited in claims 1, 3-4 and 7-11.
- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Mammino et al (US 5,552,005) discloses a method of constructing a seamed flexible imaging sheet. Yu et al (US 6,074,504) discloses a process for treating a seamed flexible electrostatographic imaging belt.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang T Van whose telephone number is 703-306-9162. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00Am 7:00Pm M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robin Evans can be reached on 703-305-5766. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3742

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

QV QV

August 5, 2004

Quang T Van

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3742